

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/554,133	10/20/2005	Clifford J Herman	1332 WO/US	9352	
Jeffrey S Boon	7590 06/04/2007 e		EXAM	INER	
Mallinckrodt Inc 675 McDonnell Boulevard PO Box 5840 St Louis, MO 63134			CLAYTOR, DE	CLAYTOR, DEIRDRE RENEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1617		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/554,133	HERMAN, CLIFFORD J
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Renee Claytor	1617
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period tree to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. & 133)
Status	(,		
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 M. This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 1.	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)□ 10)□	Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-50 is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o ion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	wn from consideration. or election requirement. er. epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). rected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
12)⊠ a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 11/14/2005.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te

Art Unit: 1617

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, namely claims 1-23, in the reply filed on 4/30/2007 is acknowledged. It is requested that Applicant submit a clear copy of claims 1-23 in response to this Office Action and use identifiers such as 'currently amended', 'withdrawn', or 'new/cancelled' etc. to denote all the claims. Examiner, for, the sake of compact prosecution, is examining the claims instead of sending a Nature of Improper Amendment.

Objections

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because: there is no reference of priority to PCT/US04/33268.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "ascorbic acid". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 1617

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Midha et al. (US Patent 6,127,385) in view of Epstein et al. (US Pg-Pub 2002/0103162).

Midha et al. teach solutions comprised of methylphenidate that is dissolved in an aqueous or non-aqueous solvent such as propylene glycol and an organic acid such as ascorbic acid (meeting the limitations of claims 9-10, 12, 14-15, 17 and 19; Col. 4, lines 59-63). The solution further contains aromatic oils as flavoring agents (meeting the limitations of claims 13, 18 and 23; Col. 4, lines 59-63). Midha et al. further teach that injectable solutions may be prepared using water (further meeting the limitation of claims 9, 14 and 19; Col. 5, lines 21-23).

Midha et al. do not teach the antioxidant as any listed in claim 1, the amounts of each component listed, the specific polyols listed in claims 11, 16 and 21 or the glycol listed in claim 22.

Epstein et al. teach pharmaceutical preparations comprised of methylphenidate compounds. It is taught that the preparations may be formulated in a biologically acceptable medium, such as water (solvent) and polyols (non-aqueous solvent; with glycerin, sorbitol and polyethylene glycol listed) and mixtures thereof (meeting the

Art Unit: 1617

limitations of polyols in claims 11, 16 and 21; paragraph 0250 and 0268). It is further taught that antioxidants may be present in the composition, with citric acid being amongst the possible antioxidants listed (meeting the limitations of claims 1, 3 and 7; paragraph 0274). Epstein et al. also teach the use of flavoring agents (paragraph 0273; meeting the limitation of claim 8).

Furthermore, it is obvious to vary and/or optimize the amounts of methylphenidate, organic acid and aqueous and non-aqueous solvents provided in the composition, according to the guidance provided by Midha et al. and Epstein et al. to provide a composition having the desired properties such as the desired concentrations and percentages of each component to formulate an effective methylphenidate solution for administration. It is noted that "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Accordingly, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Midha et al., which teach pharmaceutical solutions comprised of methylphenidate and an organic acid dissolved in propylene glycol and water, with the teachings of Epstein et al. which teach methylphenidate preparations as well and include citric acid as an organic acid that can be used in the composition, as well as a solvent and non-aqueous solvents. One would be motivated to use the citric acid taught by Epstein et al. in the composition of Midha et al. because Midha et al. teach solutions comprised of organic acids and there would be a

Application/Control Number: 10/554,133 Page 5

Art Unit: 1617

reasonable expectation of success that citric acid would be effective in the composition as taught by Epstein et al.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Renee Claytor whose telephone number is 571-272-8394. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SREENI PADMANABHAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER